## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

No. 5:23-CV-701-BO

BHASKAR KOUKUNTLA,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	ORDER
TOLL BROS., INC.,	)	
Defendant.	)	

This matter is before the court on Defendant's motion for an extension of time to serve responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests, [DE-34], Plaintiff's response in opposition, [DE-38], and Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery responses and request for adverse inference sanction, [DE-54]. Plaintiff served a first and second set of requests for production on September 10 and 16, 2024, respectively, and a first set of interrogatories on September 19, 2024. [DE-34] at 2. Defendant requested a thirty-day extension of time to respond to the discovery requests, which Plaintiff opposed, asserting that it would prejudice Plaintiff's ability to meet case deadlines and cause irreparable harm by delaying discovery, [DE-38] at 1–9. Plaintiff also filed a motion to compel Defendant to respond to the discovery requests and for sanctions. [DE-54]. Defendant responded to the discovery requests prior the submission of these motions to the undersigned. *See* [DE-81] (Plaintiff's motion to compel sufficiency of responses to discovery requests).

The court finds that good cause supported Defendant's request for an extension of time to respond, allows the motion for extension of time, and deems the discovery responses timely. Defendant's sought the extension early in the discovery period, there is no apparent bad faith on the part of Defendant in seeking what appears to be a routine request for an extension to respond

to two sets of RFPs and interrogatories served in a span of ten days, and any potential prejudice could have been ameliorated by requesting an extension of other deadlines. Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery responses and request for adverse sanction is denied as moot given the court's grant of the extension of time.

SO ORDERED, the 24th day of February, 2025.

United States Magistrate Judge